

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/792,232	03/03/2004	Hung-Wei Chen	250122-1330	4662	
24504	7590 03/07/2006		EXAMINER		
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP 100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, NW			FOX, CHA	FOX, CHARLES A	
STE 1750			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ATLANTA,	ATLANTA, GA 30339-5948				

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/792,232	CHEN ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Charles A. Fox	3652			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>03 March 2004</u> is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20051229.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				
Harani and Tradomark (Ithica					

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on December 29, 2005 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner. Reference "P" was reviewed by the examiner, but as it is written in Chinese the examiner was not able to identify any passages therein as being relevant to the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ostwald et al. in view of Nering. Regarding claims 1 and 3-7 Ostwald et al. US 6,494,663 teaches a stocker with a shuttle comprising:

a body (32);

a plurality of cells located within said body;

an in/out port (38) disposed in said body;

a transport device (14) for moving objects from the port to a cell;

wherein said transport runs along a rail (46) which passes through said body and overlaps said port. Ostwald do not explicitly teach the transport system as being an overhead type of system. Nering US 6,280,134 teaches an overhead delivery system comprising:

a plurality of process devices(12) with bodies;

input/output ports in said bodies;

an overhead delivery system with a rail (17);

said rail overlapping said ports and passing through said body;

wherein an(25) overhead shuttle interfaces with a transfer device (30) for moving an object to and from the input/output port. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention to provide the device taught by Ostwald et al. with an overhead transport as taught by Nering in order to allow the device to move objects to various process devices without interfering with a person who may be working in the area as the transport takes place in an elevated area of the facility.

Regarding claim 2 both Ostwald et al. and Nering teach the port as being in an upper portion of the body.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon, but considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure is Gilbert et al. 2000.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles A. Fox whose telephone number is 571-272-6923. The examiner can normally be reached between 7:00-4:00 Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eileen D. Lillis can be reached at 571-272-6928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/792,232 Page 4

Art Unit: 3652

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Charles A. Fox

Examiner Art Unit 3652